burden of proof.

MR. D. GARNER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, what we have here is a challenge to the declaration of candidacy, the CAN-2 filed by Barbara Wyly on February 22nd -- February 21st for the Dearborn

Superior Court Judge position.

She filed two declarations of candidacy in this matter. The first one was filed on February 21st. In that declaration she certified that she was affiliated with the Democratic Party based upon voting in the primary for the Democratic Party at the last time, she voted in the election.

That certification -- that declaration of candidacy was certified by the commission that same day. That declaration of candidacy was false. I filed the candidate filing challenge and attached to that -- I filed that on February 28th, and attached to that I got a certified copy from the clerk of the Dearborn Circuit Court which contained Ms. Wyly's voting record.

As you can see, attached as Exhibit A, she voted as a Republican in the 2004 primary election. She then -- she also filed, however, an amended declaration of candidacy, and that was filed on February 22nd.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Give me just a second.

When you say exhibit A, that's Exhibit A to -
MR. D. GARNER: To my CAN-1.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- to your candidate challenge because you also have exhibits attached to (indiscernible); correct?

MR. D. GARNER: I just have a letter from the judicial nominated commission attached to my memorandum that I filed today. The filing of a false declaration for candidacy in a judicial race should cause that declaration to be denied.

Minimally, compliance with the law is filing a truthful candidate statement. This is not truthful.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the basis for not being truthful is?

MR. D. GARNER: She says that she voted as a Democrat in the primary, in the last primary that she voted in, and the voting record attached to it -- a voting record attached to my challenge, a certified copy of the circuit court records shows that she didn't vote as a Democrat. She voted as a Republican.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And then she filed -instead filed an amended where she switched it?

She -- on the original had x'ed the county chair

and then marked it out, apparently -- I assume those are her initials, B-A-W, and then switched it to the county chairman and provided a statement to the county chairman dated February 21st?

MR. D. GARNER: Right. And that's the second issue which is the filing of what she has titled an amended declaration of candidacy. However, Title 3 does not permit -- there's nothing in Title 3 that permits the filing of an amended declaration of candidacy in this circumstance.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (Indiscernible)?

MR. D. GARNER: Well, yes, if you read the title in total, and of course your legal counsel can interpret it for you, but as I read it, there is a provision that allows for the amendment of a declaration of candidacy in 3-8 -- 3-8-2-12.5 if you are a write-in candidate.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Give me the cite again?

MR. D. GARNER: 3-8-2-12.5.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Because that only applies to write-in candidates.

MR. D. GARNER: That applies to write-in candidates.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask you this question: If -- if she is permitted to file an

amended declaration, does that resolve the issue?

MR. D. GARNER: If she's permitted to file an amended declaration, it resolves the issue except for the letter attached -- purported letter attached by the county chairman is not certified. There's no swearing under oath. There's no notarization of that particular letter. It's a letter.

I think the statute contemplates certification of the county chairman, not a letter from the county chairman. But other than that, yes, if she's permit to do file an amended declaration and the court accepts the letter as a certified statement of the county chairman, then that resolves the issue.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I appreciate being referred to as a court. Fortunately, we're not bound by this. Let me ask our legal counsel, a judge has to make these determinations, and either Leslie or Dale or either of the co-directors, is -- are they better to file an amended declaration?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, the sections I'm aware of, and I haven't been able to locate, we have it come up all

the time with respect to name changes -- people wanting to amend their declaration and change their name and is permissible -- matter of fact, it describes the procedure and code to do that prior to the deadline, and it is simply filing another declaration to amend the name.

Other than that particular section, unless you can remember another, I can't recall any other sections that do that, although, it's commonly done, especially, if it's before the deadline.

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, if I could add quickly what Dale said. It's been our practice with this primary candidate filing season, in particular. We have at least one candidate who filed and indicated a precinct in Marion County that has subsequently been changed and so that candidate to become a state representative filed another declaration of candidacy, and as far as I know, only had that change, that correction on it, and we did process it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I would note the attempted -- both documents are actually dated February 21st of 2008. Now as I understand it, you also have a secondary or other concern relating to some filings that are required to be made before

the Indiana Commission on judicial qualifications?

MR. D. GARNER: Well, if I can just go back to finish up --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize.

MR. D. GARNER: -- the statute, how the statute applies here, how we think the statute or I think the statute applies? The amendment provision that allows for amendment of a declaration of candidacy is the one that I mentioned in the event after write-in candidate.

The legislature permitted and specifically outlined the procedure for filing an amendment in that particular circumstance but they didn't provide for amendment in this particular circumstance.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I will tell you from -I think there's probably unanimity on the
commission that -- where somebody is trying to
file -- to correct an error, particularly, on the
same day it was filed, there is probably a tendency
to permit that and not elevate -- and I think
you've heard that all day today, only form over
substance.

MR. D. GARNER: I understand. And the only

other issue I would mention is there is a procedure contemplated in the statute for dealing with this, which is you can withdraw your petition under 3-8-20 -- 3-8-2-20 -- if you withdraw your petition and then refile, I think then you comply with the statute, but I understand what you're telling me.

With regard to the judicial candidacy, the only thing that was attached there was the CANs, that judicial conduct require a statement to be filed, Canon 5(4) within one week of announcing the candidacy and that also was not filed by Ms. Wyly, and that was -- that's included in my memorandum but not the primary basis of the challenge.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean that's your -- you have a letter from an Amber Holland?

MR. D. GARNER: Right. The primary basis of the challenge is not filing the declaration properly. And just to be clear, how this started, my initial challenge was based upon the information I received, which was the first information that I received, which was the false declaration, and that's on this candidate filing challenge. I did not receive the second challenge until in fact Ms. Wyly faxed it to me I think Friday of last week.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

MR. D. GARNER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Ms. Wyly.

MS. B. WYLY: Okay. Let me explain what's going on here. When I filed this, first of all, I have been a life-long Democrat -- I have been since I was a college student at Purdue University, and when I -- except for the period of time that I was in the military and could not be involved in any particular political party.

When I moved to Indiana, I had some friends that were involved in local politics here and I did vote in a Republican Primary to vote for them because the Democratic Party in Dearborn County is very weak.

And in 2004 -- I had the documents here that were researched by our local librarian -- there was no Democratic Primary candidate that I could vote for in the precinct in which I live. There was no party.

There were not Democrat -- there was no

Democratic primary, period, where I lived in Logan

Precinct 1 because there was no primary there. If

I wanted to vote for a county commission candidate,

I had to vote in the Republican Primary because

there were no Democrats running.

The same was true in 2000. If I wanted to have a say who my county commissioner was, I had to vote Republican, if I wanted to have a say in Dearborn County. But as far as whether or not I'm a Democrat or Republican, I have a Democratic Party card.

And I had sent an amendment -- I had sent an email to the election commission asking if that would be sufficient, didn't get a response back, needed to reply -- needed to get up there, and there was a snowstorm that day.

I came up here, called to see, because I couldn't remember whether or not I had -- which party I had voted for in the primary. It was a long time ago. It was closed.

So I had originally said that -- I attached a statement because I thought the card would be sufficient -- the party card was not sufficient.

So I changed it because I thought heck, I voted for Gore -- Gore's my cousin so I thought surely I voted for Gore in the last primary.

And apparently, I hadn't. When I checked the next day, when they finally opened again, I found out that I hadn't, but I did get the letter from Rick Richardson, and the letter was filed with an

amended report the next day.

3 4

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What is your response to his argument that the statute uses the word" certifies?" It does not say that it has to MS. B. WYLY:

be notarized. He did certify and I have a copy of it and I also have it on letterhead. It was also file stamped that he stated -- he did certify and affirmed that I'm a member of the Dearborn County Democrat Party and that I have the permission of the Dearborn County Democrat Party to run for the Superior Court 1 Judge of Dearborn County. signed Richard L. Richardson.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Do we have...

Yes, you have a copy. MS. B. WYLY:

Yeah, we have a copy it. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

You have the copy of it and I MS. B. WYLY: have an original that is also file stamped dated February 22nd at 11:00 a.m., and I have the individual with me who hand delivered that that day.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Well, we -- we're satisfied that it was filed at 11:22 a.m. on February 22nd.

> There is nothing that I see in MS. B. WYLY:

the statute that says that it has to be notarized. 1 That I believe is a form over substance situation. 2 It is simply a matter of trying to kick me out of 3 the -- this race because Mr. Garner is a law 4 partner of the individuals running against me and 5 on --6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: In the primary or the 7 general? 8 In the primary election. MS. B. WYLY: 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As a Democrat? 10 MS. B. WYLY: As a Democrat. 11 Where did all these CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 12 Democrats come from? 13 MS. B. WYLY: That's what I'd like to know 14 because I've been active in the Democratic Party in 15 Dearborn County for a long time. This is the first 16 I've ever seen Mr. Blondell. 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Speaking -- speaking as 18 a Republican, it strikes me that there are so few 19 of you that you ought not to be fighting with each 20 21 other. That surprised me, too. 22 MS. B. WYLY: CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I made that comment 23 late, too. 24 That surprised me, too, because MS. B. WYLY: 2.5

this was -- this was a huge surprise to all of us.

We've been -- I've been very active in the

Democratic Party in Dearborn County. We had no

idea Mr. Blondell was out there.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask this

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask this question. He does say I certify and affirm that she's a member of the Democratic Party; is that sufficient?

MR. D. GARNER: I don't think that's sufficient.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why not.

MR. D. GARNER: Because it doesn't contain any indication that he's -- that it is who it says it is. It's not sworn under.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Richard L. Richardson,
Chairman of the Dearborn County Democratic Party.

MR. D. GARNER: Certification typically involves some sort of indication, a stamp.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Well, it doesn't say notarization or affirmation. It just says -- and the reason I say that is if you were here for the prior one, this is a form that the Division uses, that we give out to all the counties. It doesn't an affirmation. It doesn't say I swear. It assembly says I certify. That's the form that the

2.5

2.4

Division itself hands out.

MR. D. GARNER: Well, I think --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I think that is the Division interpreting its -- its own regulations as simply refining the word "certify."

MR. D. GARNER: I understand. I take it that both you and the Division then disagree with me and I -- I can appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm telling you the form that the Division does give out only says certification and that's the one that we just spent an hour and a half fighting over a couple of minutes ago -- perhaps it wasn't that long. It just seemed that long.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: It just seemed that long.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. On the certification issue, the thing that troubles me is that something that was sworn to that you swore to said I voted as a Republican or I voted as a Democrat when you didn't.

MS. B. WYLY: But I actually believed that I did because I did vote in the general election as a Democrat. I distinctly remember voting for Al Gore and in 2___ -- I did vote for Al Gore. I could not

_

remember who I voted for in the primary.

I had to actually -- we actually tried to call at -- it was -- there was a snowstorm on February 21st, and I actually tried to call and I called the -- and Brad King was with me, and we actually tried to call Dearborn County to see how I voted, and I could not...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: When -- when was this?

MS. B. WYLY: This was February 21st. We called at 4:20 in the afternoon. Dearborn County Clerk's Office had closed down and so I signed off on that because I was not sure I'd be able to get back up again. I felt very uncomfortable with that.

I called the next -- I called -- it took me four hours to make a two-hour trip back to Dearborn County that night because --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And this is on the 21st?

MS. B. WYLY: On the 21st. The weather was that bad.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: My town in Jasper was pretty bad that night.

MS. B. WYLY: It was nasty and I was -VICE CHAIR A. LONG: She was in Indianapolis
on the 21st then drive home.

2.4

MS. B. WYLY: It was -- it was a terrible night. It was a terrible night. And I really -- to be truthful with you, I would have withdrawn my candidacy because I thought this just is not worth life and limb for. And I really did not -- and I had a hearing, I had a court hearing the next day --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: On the 22nd?

MS. B. WYLY: On the 22 at 11:00 o'clock, and I knew there was no way I was going to make that trip back up here again if I had to. So I thought well, I probably did vote that way and I'll double-check the next morning. I got --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The next morning, being the 22nd?

MS. B. WYLY: The 22nd. I double-checked the next morning. I got -- I called. As soon as I got back, I talked to -- first of all, I could not get a hold of Rick Richardson. Rick Richardson is -- I had been calling Rick Richardson since and emailing him since September of last year.

I talked to the Democratic Party and made my --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: This was on the 22nd?

MS. B. WYLY: Yeah, on the 21st I called,

- 11

could not get ahold.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The 21st or the 22nd?

MS. B. WYLY: On the 21st, I called.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The 21st, you made a bunch of calls, you couldn't figure it out so you just went ahead and signed the form and filed it?

MS. B. WYLY: I went ahead and signed it as my best guess that that's what I had done.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And then on the 22nd, you went and checked?

MS. B. WYLY: I called Rick as soon as I got back and ask him to do the letter for me because it was my understanding I could file an amended one the next day before noon if I was mistaken.

So I went back and I called Rick could not get ahold of Rick. I finally tracked Rick down about 10:30 at night that night. Rick did the letter for me. I met him in a snowstorm the next morning at 8:00 o'clock in the morning.

My husband hand carried this form back up here in another snowstorm and got it here at 11:00 o'clock to make sure that we had this correct because I didn't want to make it -- to do it ill legally or wrongfully either.

I just really was not sure what I had done

because I didn't remember who I voted for. But I wanted to make sure I had it right. I knew who I voted for in the general election. I could not remember what -- how I voted in the primary.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So basically you filed -- you filed -- the concern I have is that your second filing was dated the same date as your first filing. They're both dated February 21st.

MS. B. WYLY: That's the day I filled out the paperwork.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That was the 21st.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: They're both signed on...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It's signed the 21st.

That's what I was trying to figure out, is I got

two --

MS. B. WYLY: I went -- I went back home -- I went back home and pulled the form off the internet again, signed it the 21st because I was troubled by what I had done as far as whether I had voted.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why did -- why did you check the county chairman and then uncheck it on your first one?

MS. B. WYLY: Why did I check it and then uncheck...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The county chairman box,

MS. B. WYLY: Yeah. I could not remember. I couldn't remember. I knew that I -- I knew who I voted for in the general election. I could not remember what I had done in the primary.

MR. D. GARNER: Judge, I'll, or Chairman, all I'll say is you can't file, knowingly file a false declaration and not have some consequence. You -- as a judicial candidate, you shouldn't be guessing.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I think -- I think her testimony was she didn't know it was wrong, that she thought what it was, and then she went back and fixed it that same evening, which my standpoint -- again, you know, I prefer not to elevate form over substance and I prefer to allow the voters to have their will and take a swing at these things.

You guys -- if it's as bad as it sounds like, you guys would be voting for a -- for a judge, and that's about it -- (indiscernible) as Republicans.

But in any event, I'm certainly inclined -- I guess I'm going beyond accepting a motion, but I'm definitely inclined to keep somebody on the ballot and let the voters decide and I think that's certainly the trend that this commission has attempted to do, particularly, when somebody's tried to fix it that same day. That's -- that's

1 what... VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I don't disagree with 2 that. 3 I'll accept a motion. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Does somebody want to 5 make it. I don't want to make all the motions. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why don't Dan make a 7 motion? 8 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Nope. 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No. 10 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: No. 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You mean you're making a 12 motion to... 13 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: No. I'm make 14 a motion to dismiss the complaint against Barbara 15 A. Wyly. 16 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'll second it. 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's made and 18 seconded, any other discussion? 19 (No response.) 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hearing none, all in 21 favor, signify by saying aye? 22 THE COMMISSION: Aye. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same 24 siqn? 25

(No response.) 1 Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 2 MR. D. GARNER: Thanks for your time. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Good luck, guys. 4 MS. B. WYLY: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. We are on... 6 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Do you have 8 your proxy? 9 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you want to me the 11 call other one or you're going to sit here anyways 12 13 so... COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yeah, I'll sit 14 15 here. All right. I'm going to CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 16 call No. 08-177. It is my understanding that 17 Commissioner Riordan -- Commissioner Riordan has 18 recused herself. We do have a proxy taking her 19 20 place, which is... COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Matthew 21 Hammond. 22 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Good afternoon. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Here, you can have mine 24

for the record so I can forge your credit cards.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Here, I'll give you -- I 1 want you to sign one. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I've got it sign, by the 3 This is Commission No. 08-177. way. All right. 4 It is a challenge to -- we want to welcome Matthew 5 to our board for the challenge to Kimberly J. Brown 6 who is a candidate for Marion County Superior Court 7 Judge running against the slate, I assume. 8 MS. K. BROWN: Yes, sir. 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. And then we 10 do have appearance from Steve Gray? 11 That's correct, Your Honor, or 12 MR. S. GRAY: Mr. Chairman. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I like Your Honor. 14 That's all right. 15 MR. S. GRAY: CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Congruency of -- on this 16 side we have? 17 MR. K. QUINN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is 18 And before Kevin Quinn on behalf of Terry Burns. 19 we begin, Mr. Chairman, I just want to note that I 20 have not been sworn in myself so... 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Are you planning on 22 testifying? 23 I'm making an argument but I MR. K. QUINN: 24

25

don't know if ...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If you're making an 1 argument, that's fine. 2 3 MR. K. QUINN: Okay. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If you're planning on 4 testifying, you'll be sworn in. 5 MR. K. QUINN: Very well. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We'll let you know if 7 8 you... VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I concur with you on 9 10 If we, historically, swore lawyers in, that 11 always made me uncomfortable. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That's -- that's why 12 they don't do it. 13 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And you're Mr. Quinn? 14 MR. K. QUINN: Yes, sir. 15 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Mr. Gray; correct? 16 That is correct. 17 MR. S. GRAY: CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 18 19 challenger has the burden in this particular case. 20 MR. K. QUINN: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, thank you very much. As I said -- as I 21 stated, my name is Kevin Quinn, and I'm here on 22 behalf of Mr. Terry Burns. Some of you may know 23 Mr. Burns. He is the executive director of the 2.4 25 Marion County Democratic Party. He has filed this

Okay.

registered voter here in Marion County. 2 I've been trying to get CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 3 him to turn the damn thing off and ... 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Make it an executive 5 order. 6 I want to make him -- I CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 7 apologize --8 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I apologize. 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- for Commissioner 10 11 Dumezich. Dumezich. COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 12 Then went back to the CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 13 old one. 14 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Yeah. 15 MR. K. QUINN: And it's been a long afternoon 16 so I'll try and keep this brief. The basis for 17 Mr. Burns's challenge is not terribly complex but 18 its simplicity shouldn't be construed as -- meaning 19 20 it's unimportant or insignificant in any -- in any -- by any stretch of the imagination because 21 there are very real consequences to the other 22 candidates in this race who have properly filed 2.3 their declarations and would seek their Party's 24 nomination at the May primary. 2.5

challenge in his individual capacity as a

1.3

That being said, candidates for superior court judge are required by statute to fill out the declarations of candidacy with the Secretary of State, as the Commission is -- is well aware of, and those declarations must contain certain information, and among the items of information that must be included in the declaration are the candidate's precinct, the township, and complete residency.

The declarations also must be filed by a particular deadline as we've discussed or heard in the meeting earlier today, and that deadline for purposes of the May primary was February 22nd, 2008, and the Indiana Code, as I believe staff has cited to earlier, in one of the hearing, prevents the Secretary of State and your -- and the Election Commission or Division from accepting a final that's made after the deadline, and that's Indiana Code 3-5-4-1.9, and that will become important as we move forward with it.

But on February 21st, 2008, Kimberly J. Brown, Judge Brown, she's a small claims court judge here in Washington Township. She filed a declaration in which she certified that she was a registered voter of Precinct 8 in Washington Township and that her

2.4

residency was on located at 1724 Kessler Boulevard 1 West Drive. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Let me --3 let me stop you there. It looks like you're kind 4 of going into the exhibits. Are you going to go 5 into the evidence right now or are you going ... 6 MR. K. QUINN: I was going to highlight -- I 7 submitted a memorandum in support of our challenge. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Well, let me do it this 9 way just to speed things up. 10 11 MR. K. QUINN: Sure. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Brad, why don't you 12 swear whoever else needs to be sworn, and that way 13 we can do this (indiscernible). I think it's 14 pretty straight forward. 15 MR. B. KING: Okay. If everyone who is 16 planning to testify either in this or the remaining 17 18 cause --19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Who has not yet been sworn in? 20 MR. B. KING: -- who has not yet been sworn? 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Has everybody been 22 sworn? 23 I'm the only one that hadn't MR. K. QUINN: 24 and I was preparing an argument so I wasn't in 25

2.4

attendance.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Who's going to present the evidence here?

MR. K. QUINN: I was. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the evidence is documentary.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They have to be produced -- you have to put them in through someone.

MR. K. QUINN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you can do that.

MR. K. QUINN: I can do that through Judge Brown and Mr. Burns, if necessary.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. In that case they've already been sworn.

MR. K. QUINN: And I'll just touch on some of the points that were made in the memorandum and then we can examine the witnesses, but Mr. Burns is challenging this declaration because Judge Brown has not complied with the requirements of filing a declaration, and therefore, her declaration is void and she is ineligible to be on the primary ballot in May.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Are you going anywhere rather than just the precinct issue? The only issue is the precinct issue?

MR. K. QUINN: That's correct, and the fact 1 that she cannot (indiscernible) that deficiency in 2 her declaration at this time. If we turn to 3 Exhibit E, and I guess I could ask Mr. Burns these 4 questions here now. 5 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 OUESTIONS BY MR. KEVIN M. QUINN: 8 Mr. Burns, could you, please, tell the 9 Commission your occupation? 10 11 A Yes. I'm Executive Director of the Marion 12 County Democratic Party. And in that position, could you tell the 13 Commission a little bit and some of your duties? 14 Certainly. I run the day-to-day operations of 15 A the party, work with candidates, work with 16 potential candidates on (indiscernible). 17 Basically, the work we have for the county 18 19 chairman. 20 And you've had past experience with elections, I 21 would presume? 22 A Yes. And are you familiar with the Marion County 23

voting -- voting precincts?

24

25

A

Yes, I am.

1 Okay. And are you aware that those precincts 2 have recently changed? 3 Yes. 4 Okay. And are you aware that they are -- the 5 Marion County Clerk's Office has published maps which indicate the current voting precincts --6 7 Yes, I am. A 8 -- for 2008? Have you seen those maps? 9 I have. 10 I'm going to turn now to Exhibit E which is 11 included in the materials with our memorandum, and I'm going to share it here with Mr. Burns as 12 well. 13 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 15

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Burns, as we -- as we flip through there, I'm just going to just flip through the exhibits real quick. B is the challenge you filed?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. T. BURNS: One moment. That is correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. And then C and D

and E are all -- involve the precincts for this as
well?

Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

I would just direct Mr. Burns' attention and the

Commission's attention to Exhibit E, and could

MR. T. BURNS:

you tell me what this exhibit is? 1 This exhibit is a map produced by Indy GIS 2 showing the precincts in Washington Township. 3 Now have you seen this map before? 4 Yes, I have. 5 And you're familiar with it? 6 7 Yes. Could you tell me where Washington Township 8 is 8 9 located? If you look at the map, Washington Township 8 is 10 in kind of the upper right hand corner of the 11 map, the northeast corner of Washington 12 Township. 13 Okay. And have you --14 It's off -- it's off 465 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 15 up there in the corner? 16 MR. T. BURNS: Yeah. 17 It's just above the VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 18 WS008? 19 MR. T. BURNS: Yeah, WS008. 20 It appears to be in the CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 21 Castleton area for those of us familiar with Marion 22 County. 23 Is it all the way... VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 2.4

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

25

It goes all the way to

river? 1 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Yeah. 2 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It goes to White River, it looks like? 4 5 MR. T. BURNS: Yeah. Basically on this map it looks like it goes north to 96th Street and west, 6 7 or east, I should say -- well, that street's not marked there, but down south of 4 -- south of 8 465 --9 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And 82nd. 11 MR. T. BURNS: -- and it appears west of 12 Keystone. It goes all -- it goes 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Keystone, 82nd, and then up Allisonville to 465 and 14 around to White River? 15 16 MR. T. BURNS: That's what it appears, yeah. 17 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Was this approximately 18 it, do you agree? 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Absolutely. That's what 20 I just heard. 21 So that's Washington Precinct 8; correct? 22 Correct. 23 And have you seen --2.4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That is -- let me --

that is the post -- that is the current Washington

1	Township 8?
2	MR. T. BURNS: Yes, that is the current
3	Washington Township 8.
4	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: When was reprecincting
5	done, included?
6	MR. T. BURNS: I believe
. 7	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: When was the agreement
8	reached?
9	MR. T. BURNS: I believe it was approved by,
10	I believe the commission, was December 26th.
11	MS. P. POTESTA: December 27th was the date.
12	The 26th of December was the tenth day at noon, it
13	hadn't come to the commission because
14	(indiscernible) and there's no objections filed.
15	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There were no
16	observations filed so by operation,
17	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It never came before the
18	commission.
19	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: it never came before
20	the commission.
21	MR. T. BURNS: Correct. And we've been
22	operating (indiscernible).
23	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We thought we
24	thought apparently, you guys worked it out?
25	MP T BIIDNS. Ves we did

MR. K. QUINN: And I'll direct the 1 Commission's attention to Exhibit C which is, 2 obviously a printout from the Marion County Clerk's 3 Office, which is just a little bit of history 4 behind the change in precincts. 5 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'm sorry, Exhibit? 6 7 MR. K. QUINN: C. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 8 It explains the change in 9 MR. K. QUINN: precincts in Marion County. 10 11 Mr. Burns, have you ever seen the declaration of candidacy filed by Kimberly J. Brown? 12 Yes, I have. 13 A And is it attached to the memorandum in support 14 of the (indiscernible) on Exhibit A? 15 Yes, it is. 16 Okay. When you reviewed Exhibit A, did you 17 determine if there was anything that appeared 18 19 out of the ordinary or improper? 20 I noticed that the precinct in question, Precinct 8, I had a question about because I 21 22 knew under the new precincting maps that Precinct 8 was now in the northern tier of 23 24 Marion County.

25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Where was it earlier?

MR. T. BURNS: Down a little further south, 1 mid -- kind of mid township level. 2 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Anywhere on Kessler? MR. T. BURNS: Yes, it did include Kessler 4 Boulevard. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Would it have included 6 7 her prior address -- the 1724 Kessler, was that within 8 before? 8 9 MR. T. BURNS: I believe so, yes. 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So basically this comes 11 down to she wrote her old precinct, not her new precinct now? 12 MR. T. BURNS: Correct. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And we just went through 14 reprecincting in December? 15 MR. T. BURNS: Uh-huh. Correct. 16 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And that's the basis of 18 the challenge? 19 MR. T. BURNS: Correct. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Go ahead. 21 Q And Mr. Burns, obviously, you can see the 22 residency information that was provided on the declaration of candidacy; is that correct? 23 24 Correct. A

25

Q

And what is that address?

1 A 1724 Kessler Boulevard West Drive Indianapolis, 2 46228. And to your knowledge is 1724 Kessler Boulevard 3 West Drive Indianapolis located in Precinct 8 of 4 5 Washington Township? To the best of my knowledge, it is not. 6 7 Okay. Do you have any idea where it is located? 8 I don't know the exact new precinct but I know 9 it's not 8. 10 Okay. 11 MR. K. QUINN: Those are all the questions I 12 have for Mr. Burns. If I may --CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 13 Oh, I'm sorry. 14 you... 15 MR. S. GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. STEPHEN GERALD GRAY: 19 Mr. Burns, I'd like to direct your attention to 20 your Exhibit C that was attached to your 21 memorandum. Do you have that in front of you, 22 sir? Yes, I do now. 23 \boldsymbol{A}

Do you see where it says that on December the

28th that new precinct boundaries were adopted;

24

- 1 you see that, don't you?
- 2 || A Yes, I do, in that first paragraph.
 - You see the last sentence of that first paragraph where it says the voter registration board must update more than 630,000 records in the database in time for the election; do you see that?
- 8 A Yes, I do.

4

5

6

7

9

10

- Q Do you have any knowledge of when that updating process began?
- 11 **A** I don't know the exact date, but I know it was
 12 began I believe sometime in January.
- 13 Q Do you have any knowledge of when that process ended?
- 15 A I know it was in place before our special election.
- 17 ||Q| Okay. So just within the past few days?
- 18 A No, it was earlier than that. They've -- they

 19 mailed out post cards but it had been completed

 20 prior to then.
- Okay. Tell me, do you have any firsthand
 knowledge of when the database with regard to
 Kimberly Brown's precinct would have been
 updated?
 - A I have no firsthand knowledge of that.

- 2 So you cannot tell the Commission that her database was updated before she executed her declaration of candidacy, can you?
 - A I cannot say that, no.
 - Q And with regard to when these cards went out, you don't have any knowledge of when Ms. Brown may have received one of these cards, do you?
 - A I do not.

5

6

7

8

- 9 Q Now you don't contend that if somebody lives in
 10 Precinct No. 8 that they're ineligible if
 11 they're otherwise qualified to run pore superior
 12 court judge, do you?
- 13 ||A| I can't make that determination.
- Okay. And you're not contending that somebody

 who lives in the 43rd Precinct is ineligible to

 run for superior court judge, do you?
- 17 **A** Why make that determination.
- 18 Q But you're not contending that, though?
 - A No.

19

- 20 Q Okay. You're not -- you're not suggesting to
 21 the board that Ms. Brown had notice from the
 22 Marion County Election Board prior to filing her
 23 declaration of candidacy about the change, are
 24 you?
 - A I don't know whether she had notice or not

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Did you offer to do that 1 with Ms. Brown? 2 MR. T. BURNS: I was never asked. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Did you do 4 it with all slated candidates? 5 MR. T. BURNS: Only if they called. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So this was 7 only if someone called and asked you? 8 9 MR. T. BURNS: Right. 10 And --11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And let me ask one more question. Why would you feel the need to do that? 12 MR. T. BURNS: Just wanted to make sure all 13 14 the documents were proper and... CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Wanted to make sure they 15 did it right? 16 17 MR. T. BURNS: They got it right. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That they didn't 18 19 (indiscernible)? 20 MR. T. BURNS: Correct. And are you aware if other candidates in fact 21 Q 22 corrected their declarations of candidacy? I believe there were at least two. 23 A 24 Okay. And do you know who those two individuals 25 were?

- 1 | A I believe it was Judge Dreyer and Judge Tanya
 2 | Walton Pratt.
 - Q Okay. And at this time I'll refer you to -CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: G, I believe.
 - Q To Exhibit G. Could you identify that document for me?
- 7 A Yeah. It appears to be a CAN-2 form for judge 8 David J. Dreyer.
 - Q Could you tell me what the date stamp is on that document?
- 11 **A** January 23rd, 2008 at 1:12 p.m.

4

5

6

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 12 Q If I could now direct your attention to Exhibit
 13 H. Could you tell me what that document is,
 14 please?
- 15 A This appears to be again a CAN-2 form for Judge
 16 David J. Dreyer.
- 17 **Q** And is there a different time stamp, date stamp on that document?
 - A Yeah. This basically has two stamps. One at the bottom which appears legible, February 21st, 2008, Indiana Secretary of State.
 - Q And if we were to compare these two exhibits, Exhibit G and Exhibit H side-by-side, is there any concern, the difference?
 - A Yes, the precinct numbers are changed.

1 So it appears to you that Judge Dreyer in fact Q 2 corrected his declaration of candidacy? Correct, corrected it February 21st. 3 And are you aware that -- of the deadline for 4 5 filing the declaration of candidacy? Yes. I believe it was February 21st at noon. 6 A 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you're telling me 8 that Judge Dreyer filed a false statement in his 9 precinct? I say he came back and 10 MR. T. BURNS: No. 11 corrected it. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Well, his original was 12 sworn under oath: correct? 13 I believe so, yes. 14 MR. T. BURNS: 15 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you're telling me that he filed a false statement -- I mean that's 16 17 the same argument we had in the preceding case? 18 MR. T. BURNS: Obviously, not intentionally. 19 He did make the change before the deadline. He made a mistake. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: He 21 made a mistake and got it fixed; right? 22 MR. T. BURNS: Right. 23 Q And he was --

MR. T. BURNS:

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

24

25

I would say that's inaccurate.

Inaccurate, that's the

first thing?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Only three filed them 2 correct? 3 MR. K. QUINN: Yes. 4 And everybody else got CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 5 it corrected -- other than Judge Brown, everybody 6 else got it corrected before the deadline? 7 MR. K. QUINN: No. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No. Who's -- who's 9 currently a candidate that does not have it 10 corrected? 11 I don't know that. MR. K. QUINN: 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Would that not 1.3 disqualify them? 14 MR. K. QUINN: They were not challenged. 15 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Based on? 16 MR. K. QUINN: No one challenged them 17 (indiscernible). 18 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I take it the Party 19 didn't want to challenge a slated candidate? 20 I did not, no. I was under the 21 MR. T. BURNS: assumption that all of our candidates had filed it 22 correct or that were amended CAN-2. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Given the fact that 24 25 you've got slated candidates that have ones that

incorrect precincts.

I	
1	are on right now that swear under oath, swear
2	under oath that they're in the wrong precinct. Are
3	you interested in the (indiscernible) challenge or
4	are you going to correct that one as well? I'd
5	think real carefully about that.
6	MR. K. QUINN: Mr. Chairman, I would just
7	point out that the candidates have that Judge
8	Dreyer and Judge Pratt have corrected their
9	declarations
10	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand that, but
11	which.
12	MR. K. QUINN: prior to their
13	COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: There are
14	others that have not.
15	MR. K. QUINN: I understand that, but there's
16	been no challenge in those declarations.
17	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yeah. But they've sworn
18	under oath that that's the correct precinct and
19	it's not. I'd think they'd be taken off the ballot
20	for perjury. I mean that's an under oath
21	declaration; correct?
22	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'd have to agree with
23	the commissioner's banter apparently that it was
24	entered that it's a mistake.
	II

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I agree -- I agree

completely. 1 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I believe perjury is 2 a -- is a rather harsh term to use. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I -- I agree a hundred 4 5 percent. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I don't think you can 6 7 perjure yourself by making a mistake. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I -- I agree as 8 well. 9 MR. K. QUINN: And I believe the statute 10 states that it's when a candidate knowingly makes a 11 false statement, something to that effect, and I 12 don't think that the other candidates that have ... 13 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: And there's 14 probably not a duty to correct also, which I would 15 believe? 16 MR. K. QUINN: 17 But... COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I think... 18 I'll get the 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (indiscernible). 20 I don't think -- they've 21 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: probably got undisputable facts here. 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand. 23 I think it would power VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 24 25 down to a legal issue. I mean I -- I don't want to

preclude you all, but is that your position?

MR. S. GRAY: Well, --

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I mean...

MR. S. GRAY: -- our position is slightly different. Our position is that the changing of a voter's precinct was a three-step process: The first step is for what happened on December the 28th when the boundaries were changed. The second step is when the records are updated. And the third step is when the notice is given.

The Marion County Clerk's Office and the Marion County Election Board have adopted a format for notifying voters, and that particular format which I'm have as an exhibit here in just a minute says that you will be register to vote at this address when you receive this notice.

And it is our contention that legally she is not -- her precinct has not changed until she receives this notice. It says this office has received your application to be a registered voter. You appear to be eligible to vote. You will be registered to vote at this address, notifying her of the new precinct when you receive this notice.

So the change of her precinct is not effective until she receives the notice. So it is our

2.4

contention that on the date that she filed her candidacy, she had not received her notice yet, and that until she had, Precinct 8 was the correct one.

We don't even know for sure based on the evidence that the challenger has presented when that information was updated in the database at the clerk's office. If it was dated -- if it was updated on February the 25th, had Ms. Brown contacted the voter registration board on the 20th or the 21st, the day of the deadline, she may very well have been told that she was still in Precinct 8.

So just to merely say that somehow there's a strict liability and everybody in Marion County is charged with notice on December the 28th, when the databases are not even updated, that makes no sense whatsoever, because anybody who called in to the election board on December the 29th, would -- would not be told that their precinct had been changed. So that's our position.

MR. K. QUINN: I'm sorry to interrupt. I was just wondering if you could ask counsel here if that's her interpretation of the statute?

MS. L. BARNES: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Go ahead.

MS. L. BARNES: Thank you. According to 3-11-1.5-24 and 25, they're the effective dates for when precinct changes take effect.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: When -- keep going 3-11-1.5...

MS. L. BARNES: Dash 24 and 25 on Page 258.

The precinct establishment order becomes effective and then it refers to Section 25, so you have to read them in conjunction, but the precinct establishment order becomes effective...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: On the first day of the declaration of candidacy to be filed which was...

MS. L. BARNES: May not. That says it may not become effective.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Oh.

MS. L. BARNES: Sorry. Becomes effective -Section 24, sorry. The precinct establishment
order becomes effective on the first date permitted
under Section 25 of this chapter -- oh, that's
if -- sorry -- it is -- there are two processes by
way the precincts can be effective. One is if it
comes before the commission and one if there's a
ten-day (10) notice -- I apologize -- is it Section
18?

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Dale, do you

1 have...

MR. D. SIMMONS: I think the parties have already stipulated the effective date of the order. It was the date...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We're stipulating -- the effective date of the order -- I don't think there's any stipulation to the effective date of the order. The question is, as I understand it, Mr. Gray's argument is that's not enough. He's arguing there's a three part process.

The final portion of which -- No. 3 which is actual notice to the individual voters, and that's -- that's what I thought the question to you guys were.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Having -- having received one of those notices in the mail myself, I think it was my view it would be an error on the part of the Marion County Voter Registration. They sent acknowledgment notices out to folks to advise them of the precinct change. I don't know that that they did that or we advised them to do that.

An acknowledgment notice does advise the voter that when you receive --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Now you know?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Now -- you know, when you

_ -

2.0

receive this, you're now registered at that address, even though the voter may have been previously registered at another address -- the acknowledgment notice does say that. It says --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I thought that's the one you were reading from a moment ago.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Because the notice issued under 3-7-33-5 it's required for new registrants and registrants that have changed their address.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And they just send them to everybody?

MR. D. SIMMONS: They send them to everybody.

MS. L. BARNES: Mr. Chairman, I think the question was when do the precincts become effective, and they became effective on December 27th, 2007, and then if any candidate called the county voter registration office, they were able to place a candidate in the precinct.

Then there was a question asked to which we had personal knowledge about, when did the counties -- when did the statewide voter registration database begin to reflect the new precincts? And it was shortly after -- voter registration closed shortly after February 7th, and so it was before the candidate filing deadline

ended.

When candidates would ask what precinct am I in, we have the authority under state statute to look up the candidate at their request, and we could tell them what new precinct they were in, and we did receive that request from several candidates.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Several we didn't, apparently?

MS. L. BARNES: And several we didn't.

MR. S. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, could I address that very point? The Exhibit C which was put out by the Marion County Election Board suggests that voters used a polling place locator to find out what their new precinct was.

And having done that, the polling place locator, which is what the election board suggested that you use, told Ms. Brown that her address of her polling place was the same. 5540 North Michigan Road is now the voting place for precinct No. 43, but previously, it was the same voting place for Precinct No. 8.

Nowhere on this polling place indicator, does it indicate that the precinct number has changed. The precinct number does not even appear.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So if she was going to go look at that, she'd say I'm voting in the same place?

MR. S. GRAY: And she had every reason to infer that her precinct had not changed because of that, and that was by -- information that was put out by the Marion County Election Board.

I'd like to also point out one other thing to the Commission, and that is this, under the statute it is not even required that you lists your precinct number in order to file your declaration of candidacy. If you --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on.

MR. S. GRAY: 3-8-2-7. If you choose to lists your ward and city and town instead. It gives it in the alternative. The purpose behind the statute is to assure that whoever is a candidate is a registered voter in Marion County, not that they are reside in any particular precinct. So --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you're relying on the -- the disjunctive, or ward or city or town?

MR. S. GRAY: That is correct. It says the location of the candidate's precinct and township (or ward and city and town.) So my view is --

2.4

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But she didn't list the ward, did she?

MR. S. GRAY: She did not, but I think the Commission has to do a little bit of statutory interpretation here to determine what is the -- the intention of Indiana Code 3-8-2-7, it's not to exclude people who mistakenly put down 8 when they're in 43. The intention of the statute is to make sure that they're a registered voter in Marion County, which she clearly qualifies.

MR. K. QUINN: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there's no distinction in the statute for a county wide seat or a seat in the locality. The CAN-2 provides that a -- a spot for the precinct number. The statute requires either precinct number for a ward and city or town.

Ms. Brown's information, Judge Brown's information as reflected in Exhibit A, contains inaccurate information, and therefore, does not comply with Indiana Code 3-8-2-7.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Anything further from you?

MR. S. GRAY: I do have one other thing, Your Honor. I hate to resort to the law in a case like this, but --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: God help you. Mr. -Mr. Long is doing the same thing -- he hasn't
figured it out yet, so if you can help him, that
would be wonderful.

MR. S. GRAY: Well, there is precedent for what's occurred here. To give the Commission some guidance, the specific facts of this case are completely unprecedented that I could not find, but there's a case called Mason versus Gohmann. It's back from 1986. It's sort of a famous case.

You alluded to the Evan Bayh case earlier.

This is the second case that jumps to my mind.

This is a case that involves a challenge dispute to Stephen Goldsmith's candidacy. Mr. Goldsmith, if you'll remember, was a person who zealously guarded his privacy.

Somebody from the clerk's office apparently at some point in time took a piece of tape that said -- changed Stephen Goldsmith's name to L period, S period, Goldsmythe, spelled with a Y. There was a challenge by Mr. Mason then raised to Mr. Goldsmith's candidacy. It ended up in front of Judge Metz, and then reviewed by the Court of Appeals.

And the Court of Appeals gave some guidance, I

think, there, in terms of how the Commission should view something like this. And it says to allow any letters, words, or designation, including a name affixed by any other person other than the voter in a situation where the voter is unable to affix his own signature to affect the validity of the voter's registration is to provide a mechanism by way the integrity of the electoral process could easily be impaired.

2.4

Now the way -- why that applies in this situation is these changes and the notices and updating the database, these are all processes that are out of Ms. Brown's hands. These are all being done by employees of the clerk's office or the Marion County Election Board.

I'm not suggesting that it happened in this case, but one could easily see a situation in which a precinct is sort of changed late in the game or redistricting occurs, and that notice is not -- the information is not processed until after the candidate files their declaration of candidacy or that notice is purposely delayed via actions of a third party, which is what the court said, you should not deprive somebody of access to the ballot when the things were beyond their control.

And it's my view in this situation that Ms.

Brown did everything that a reasonable person would do under the -- under these circumstances. She is eligible to be a candidate for superior court judge, whether she's in 8 or 43, and I think that the challenge should be denied.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me -- let me ask -if you don't mind, let me ask Judge Brown. Why
didn't you call? Why didn't you check? I mean as
I understand it, if you had called, for example,
Leslie on the Democratic side, you would have found
out from what she just said, that you're in
Precinct 43 instead of Precinct 8?

MS. K. BROWN: I was aware that the number of polling places were decreasing. I was not aware that the precincts were changing. I relied on the voter registration card that I had, which registered me in 08, and that's what I relied on. It did not occur to me to place a call when I had before me a tangible piece of -- a document that was clear.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: This is your voter registration card from '07?

MR. S. GRAY: Could we put that into evidence?

I think we'd like to do that.

with --

MS. K. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- the county chair -- I know -- I know the county chair isn't here, we've got the county executive?

MS. K. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You didn't check with any of those?

MS. K. BROWN: I relied on my voter
registration card.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Can I ask counsel -- he raised an issue about the three step process. That intrigued me. Could you cite me your authority to that?

MR. S. GRAY: Well, I don't have a -- an appellate court case or a statute.

vice chair A. Long: Okay. The statute says that -- the steps that I'm concerned with is the requirement for it to be effective that the clerk has to mail out a notice. I'm not -- and I'm not challenging you. I'm not that familiar with the fine tune parts of the statute. And is there something in the law that causes you to believe that that third step is necessary other than the passing of the ordinance and the entering it into

the database or whatever steps they go through?

MR. S. GRAY: What I'm relying on is the language that the Marion County Election Board chose to use when they sent out those notices. Now what you have in front of you in our Exhibit No. 2 is the old notice that Ms. Brown had received, the one that told her that she was in Precinct 8.

And the language on that notice is identical to the language on the new notice that she's received, which says you will be registered to vote at this address when you receive this notice. And I believe that Ms. Brown or any other reasonable person has the right to take exhibit No. 2 and carry it around with them and think I received this notice, and until I receive another one, this is where I'm registered at, and she didn't receive this other notice until March the 6th. And so...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: The new notice, March the 6th?

MR. S. GRAY: The new notice was sent to her on March the 6th, is when she received it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And do we have copies of those?

MR. S. GRAY: I do, and I'd like to have her swear to that, since she's under oath.

DIRECT EXAMINATION 1 2 QUESTIONS BY MR. STEPHEN GERALD GRAY: Ms. Brown, on this new notice labeled Exhibit 3 No. 1, would you tell the Commission when you 4 received it? 5 It was in my mailbox on March the 6th, 2008. 6 7 Now there's some handwriting that appears on the back of that, is that your handwriting? 8 9 Yes. A 10 And you put that notice on there received; is that correct? 11 12 A Yes. MR. S. GRAY: We'd offer this. 13 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Is there a 14 Pitney Bowes' stamp on that one as well? 15 MS. K. BROWN: 16 No. MR. S. GRAY: This is all we have, is what 17 I have copies for everybody. 18 came. Identify the exhibit. 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: MR. S. GRAY: That's Exhibit 1. 20 21 MR. B. KING: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, 22 (indiscernible) that the record would be --CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Exhibits. 23 The exhibits offered by the MR. B. KING: 24

25

parties.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: All the exhibits offered received.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (Indiscernible).

MR. K. QUINN: Mr. Chairman, if I could. I think Mr. Long was onto a point there that it is -- that the notice is not required by statute. I don't know for a fact that that's the case, but it's my belief that there is no notice requirement for the Marion County Election Board to advise voters that their precinct has changed.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I just thought it was a natural response to this issue.

MR. K. QUINN: Right. I understand.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Hearing -- felt it was raised and I thought maybe I had missed something all the way and I wasn't trying to...

MR. K. QUINN: And certainly, Ms. Brown, Judge Brown has indicated that she was aware that the precincts were changing and that they were being reduced, I believe she testified. I think anyone who would -- could infer that when there's going to be a reduction in the number of precincts, there's probably going to be a change to the...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm good with you on that.

MR. K. QUINN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Explain to me how all the other judges messed up, too?

MR. K. QUINN: Well, the point there, I think with respect, Mr. Chairman, is that there's no challenge made to those declarations.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It's hard for me to have a lot of sympathy to your position under that situation. I mean both -- as I understand it -- Dale, correct me if I'm wrong, as I understand it, the Commission's -- kind of the Commission's goal here is to look to see if there's substantial compliance?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Actually...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Describe for me what our -- what our...

MR. D. SIMMONS: Not had an opportunity to discuss this, even though we've been through several challenges, but the -- the standard in 3-8-1-2, Subsection G, which is on Page 155. At the bottom of the left-hand column -- it --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 3-8-1 -- hold on, 3-8-1-2, Subsection?

MR. D. SIMMONS: G.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: G, the commission or

election board shall, okay.

MR. D. SIMMONS: And -- yeah, that's the one, that deny a filing if -- if they determine that the candidate has not complied with the applicable requirements for the candidate set forth in the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Indiana or this title.

I don't -- I don't know if that gets you anywhere closer to where you need to go with...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Well, it doesn't have the word "substantial compliance," I would note. It says comply.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And it -- and I don't think there's much wiggle room there.

MR. K. QUINN: Yeah. I believe that's a
mandatory term, "there shall."

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If that's a mandatory term, we need to go back and revisit several that we've already passed.

MR. S. GRAY: Well, the Goldsmith's case,
Mr. Goldsmith's name did not appear as L. S.
Goldsmythe on the ballot, and the Court of Appeals
didn't have any trouble giving him access to the
ballot.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you have a copy of

1 this case?

MR. S. GRAY: I do.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I hate to sound like a judge.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It's good practice.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (Indiscernible).

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Well, you may be at some point appointed to the federal bench or something.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No. You know too much about me for me to become a judge.

MR. K. QUINN: If I may drive a station without having read in detail the Goldsmith case there, I believe counsel had stated that that case centered on something that was beyond the control of the voter.

I think Ms. Brown had well within her control the ability, the possibility of determining what precincts she was in, the correct precinct, and she was a registered voter. In fact, Judge Dreyer, Judge Pratt demonstrated that they were able to determine the correct precincts in which they were registered voters and they were able to file amended declarations.

MR. S. GRAY: Of course, we don't know when Judge Pratt and Judge Dreyer's information was

updated in the database, and that's the fallacy of the argument.

MR. K. QUINN: But I think the point has already been made that there is no notice requirement with respect to the change in the precincts. The precincts were changed immediately -- effective immediately at the end of 2007.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: What's the section again,
Leslie or Dale, that refer to the contents of the
declaration?

MS. L. BARNES: 3-8-2-7(a)(2), is what the Commission is being asked to look at, 3-8-2-7 Subsection (a)(2) 2.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: If she had misspelled Washington or put Drive rather than Avenue, would your position be the same, in terms of her address?

MR. K. QUINN: I believe that the statute requires a complete address, and if the address was incomplete, then yes, I believe that she would fail to comply with that -- that section of the code.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It says candidate's complete residence address.

MR. K. QUINN: I mean I presume that there's a

Kessler Boulevard East Drive and a Kessler
Boulevard West Drive. I think that there -- if she
had left out the west, there could be confusion,
and the address would be incomplete and fail to
comply with that statute.

We've used the word CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: "comply," and you've suggested a very strict I would note that in this case that definition. they specifically say in the absence of fraud election statutes generally will be liberally construed to guarantee to the electorate an opportunity to freely cast his ballot to prevent his disenfranchisement to uphold the will of the electorate, which I think is essentially what we've been saying about form over substance throughout at least the day today, which is that we're going to look at -- we're not going to trip people up on technicalities; particularly, something -- and again, I -- I have a real problem with -- with this particular situation, because it isn't just a situation, it's a game of got you, because you know, to me standing outside, it looks like that she won the slate of candidate, and you didn't challenge three other Democrats that apparently are on the ballot and (indiscernible) what the number

1

2

3

4

5

6

is.

MR. K. QUINN: I've been thinking about that, I'm thinking of the three that I looked at, one of many were the three that did not need to be amended because they got it right the first time so I apologize if (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There's none?

MR. T. BURNS: There were no Democratic judges

I know of that had it wrong.

MR. K. QUINN: They originally did amend it -- remember, there's three that are not amended but those were the three that...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I apologize in our prior -- I was relying on -- with all due respect Michelle -- I was relying on Michelle, and there may be a whole slate of Republican judges in the same boat -- who knows? I have no idea. Or other candidates for that matter.

MR. K. QUINN: And Mr. Chairman, if I could point to another case that calls for strict compliance with the statute, that would be *Brials*, (Phonetic) 530 N.E.2d 1187.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It says the election commission shall strictly construe?

MR. K. QUINN: It states that -- in the

court's holdings it state the petition was not timely filed with the Secretary of State in accordance with the applicable statutes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I by the filing. It's clearly and untimely filed and it clearly is a strict construction. It is 1201 (indiscernible).

MR. K. QUINN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm sorry, that was a legal term.

MR. K. QUINN: The cite -- this case actually cites to another case, the Bodine case -- Bodine and its prodigy have demanded strict compliance with the statutes, and they -- there's an excerpt from the Bodine case and it states in Bodine that this section does not purport to apply merely to declarations of candidacy.

So I think that it's clear from this case the Briles (Phonetic) case and the Bodine case the declaration of candidacy falls in strict compliance in interpretation of the statutes, and a strict compliance of the statute at issue here would require Judge Brown to have made a declaration of candidacy that contained fully accurate information, including the accurate identification of her precinct, rather.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Anything else from the commissioners?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Gray?

MR. S. GRAY: Just final thought, Your Honor, is I think it's pretty hard for counsel to get around the language in the Goldsmith case, and I heard one of the commissioners state earlier this afternoon that before we deny access to a candidate, we should err on the side of access if there's any question.

In this case, Ms. Brown is totally qualified to be a superior court judge by training, admission to the bar, and by residency. She's qualified whether she's in Precinct 8 or qualified in Precinct 43. Certainly, there was no knowing misrepresentation on her declaration of candidacy.

If anything, the Election, the Marion County
Election Board chose the process of which they're
getting notice out, which is certainly partly
responsible for this, I'm going to ask the Board to
err on the side of the benefit of the voters of
Marion County and give an otherwise qualified
candidate access to the ballot. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. I'll accept

a motion or discussion or do you want to do a 1 discussion on the motion? 2 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I don't know. 3 whatever you want to do. 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Or do you want to talk 5 first? 6 7 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: No. I'm -- I'm fully prepared to do either. I'm not going to make a 8 motion at this point because I'm -- I'm torn here a 9 10 little bit, which means the two statutes, I think we're entitled to interpret and enforce, I guess --11 that's our duty to enforce them, the election 12 codes. 13 MR. M. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, could you point 14 15 to the statute? CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm certain you can ask 16 Dale, if you want to give it to him. 17 MR. M. HAMMOND: You had mentioned earlier 18 19 that there -- there is strict compliance and 20 maybe... 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The word use -- the word use was the word complies, and Dale, what was the 22 cite? 23 Actually, I think I may be 24 MR. M. HAMMOND: talking about something different. 25

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 3-8-1-2 is what you're 1 talking about? 2 MR. K. QUINN: You said there was a pending 3 issue, 1201, it's -- it's... 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Oh, it's legal. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (indiscernible). 6 MR. K. QUINN: Right. 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And my legal basis for 8 that? 9 10 MR. K. QUINN: Or the right statutory... I relied upon my 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: counsel. 12 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: You know, we have strict 13 compliance that said certified mail notice, the 14 statute says -- I mean we've dealt with that -- you 15 know, because I think I disagree with the 16 legislature, but you know, I think you put it in 17 the mail, certified mail -- I mean we live -- we 18 19 live our lives with that -- I mean you know (indiscernible) filed, but that's not filed here so 20 that's -- you know, we're pretty strict on that. 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 22 Now on the other hand, though, with respect to campaign finance, for 23 example, we've allowed filings. 2.4

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: County clerks.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: County filings --1 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: County filings. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- upon the showing 3 that... 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: But we can -- we can't 5 6 accept a county clerk filing --CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Like this 7 (indiscernible). 8 9 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: -- of a declaration 10 candidate, Mr. Fields -- I mean he filed clearly timely to be a state legislator, but he filed in 11 the wrong place, and I mean that -- it appeared to 12 me that was an ideal -- I mean an otherwise --13 well, I don't want to say, but we didn't get into 14 the contents of his application, I don't quess. 15 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: He didn't have 16 any of his precinct information filled out. 17 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Somebody did. I didn't 1.8 19 want... COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: And he didn't 20 21 have his economic interest forms and he didn't have 22 any... CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: He had a variety of 23 other problems. 24

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH:

1 wrong than right.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Well, and I agree, and I don't have any questions. This attorney is -- you know, meets the legal requirements, has been a practicing lawyer and lives in the right county and the town -- I don't know how your district is (indiscernible).

The question to me proposed under -- is very simple, and I'm not necessarily saying how I feel, but it seems that what I'm looking at, the statute requires -- wait, I'll find it here in a minute -- 3-8-2-7(a)(2), a statement that the candidate is a registered voter and the location of the candidate's precinct and township, then it says or, I guess that means if there's an alternative, the ward, city or town, county and state.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The word "of" -- the think the word "of" is in there.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I don't see an "of" in mine.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No. The word "ward" and the city or town.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: No, ward and city.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right. So you have to do -- you have to do ward and city, right. I was

reading from the form -- our form says ward. 1 the point is you can do either precinct or ward. 2 3 MS. L. BARNES: Mr. Chairman, if I might. Marion County legally does not use wards anymore. 4 The political parties do. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right. 6 MS. L. BARNES: And so that option that's in 7 parentheses is not available to Marion County 8 candidates. 9 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: How do they -- I'm 10 11 confused. Did I say that right? 12 MS. L. BARNES: CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: (Indiscernible). 13 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I asked for it, 14 (indiscernible) in Evansville. How do wards -- we 15 16 don't do wards, do we? We've never -- in my 11 17 years I've been on the commission, we've never --18 that's a -- that's a --19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That's a party. 20 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: -- apportionment within 21 the -- at the county level; correct or, yeah, at the county level? The commissioners lay out the 22 wards of, or the city, I guess -- it's the city --23 it would be the city. 2.4 25 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Yeah, the only

place (indiscernible) and Chicago.

2 3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

That's (indiscernible) an VICE CHAIR A. LONG: academic discussion because neither one of them are The word's not here. here.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right.

That's not there, and the VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It just says it has -- then the precinct is wrong. question is is this a forgivable mistake? Do we have the jurisdiction and the prerogative and the or the flexibility to say, you know, you made a mistake here but this mistake is understandable and we'll forgive that.

In light of 3-8-1-2(g), which we read earlier, the commission or election board shall deny a filing if the -- if it -- we determine, dah, dah, dah, has not complied with the applicable requirements of this title. And the question is does the title require the correct insertion of precinct number in order to sustain -- to withstand the challenge?

If that's a requirement of the law, I think it's -- I think the 3-8-1-2(g) is mandatory and I don't think she meets the requirement. Ι£ the -- if that is not the requirement, if the accurate precinct number is not a requirement of

1.3

the statute, then she probably does.

And I think that's the ultimate question, where I am in my mind, when the counsel, if they choose to address this issue, those are the -- that's the question. In my mind, the only question is, is an accurate precinct number a requirement for a filing because I don't think -- there's nothing in here that says the oops or equity or mailing, it just says it has to have a precinct number on there.

And if that's -- and I don't know. I mean I don't know if there would be any authority. If counsel could enlighten me on the issue?

MR. D. SIMMONS: I don't know if this makes a different distinct between precinct number -- I don't read anything about precinct number in 3-8-2-7. It does the location of a candidate's precinct, and I -- you know, I don't know if that makes it different, but it does require notification of a candidate's precinct. I'm not sure it requires a precinct number.

MS. L. BARNES: That's what our form requests of the commission, the form.

MR. D. SIMMONS: I'm not sure if we could
trump a statute with forms but...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Location of the 1 candidate's precinct. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And there's no doubt, 3 that was your precinct? 4 MS. K. BROWN: Yes. 5 I mean we -- nobody CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 6 disputes that. The only issue is... 7 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Well, I think the dispute 8 is -- I believe it's disputed (indiscernible) --9 Precinct. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 10 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: -- or when she filed, but 11 it was her old precinct number which had been 12 moved. you know, I -- I don't know -- the 13 legislature, I'd be happy to sit down a while. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'd rather not. 15 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: They would 16 look forward to that. 17 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Yeah, that's -- we might 18 have to do a whole session to clean up this 19 20 quagmire and try to get ... Tony, you're -- you're CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 21 far out. Where I am is I view us -- I view the 22 work that applies, particularly, in light of the 23 case law looking at the level of reading the 24 statute, I don't believe that -- I believe we have 2.5

the authority as a commission to look at issues like this and resolve them in favor letting individuals go to the ballot.

2.0

I've certainly expressed that over and over today. I've read the case law. And it's not just the (indiscernible) case -- I have no reason to determine their cases, but I think that the intent of the general assembly is -- you know, words of close call, they're giving us the discretion to let somebody go to the ballot.

And that's where I am on this. You know, I think this is --

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And I respect your position.

call, agree, and if it's a close call, frankly, I'd rather see the person face the voters and let the voters decide rather than have us take people out, and that's just -- and I think I've been consistent since I've been on the commission that way.

MR. K. QUINN: I have one more comment. This goes back to the question I -- I asked earlier about the spirit that (indiscernible) if you don't --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Well, stop

using legal terms.

MR. K. QUINN: I'm just -- and I guess my question is, is the precedent of this commission the only thing, because I'm reading Statute 3-5-4-1.9 which is receiving late filings, and that to me, my interpretation of that, doesn't seem anymore or less strict or a --

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: What part is that?

MR. K. QUINN: 3-5-4-1.9.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Yeah.

MR. K. QUINN: Then those are requirements calling for a correct precinct, ward and township.

And so I -- I just wanted to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I read the word "may not" as being fairly definitive. The word "complies," I think could be substantial compliance, in that there is the document of substantial compliance of the law.

And the word that's used in our statute on review is does it comply? I read that as being we have the discretion to see if it substantially complies.

When it says may not, I don't think I have any discretion with the word may not.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I think -- I

think, you know, everybody on the board, we know 1 the facts and we know the law. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yeah. 3 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I think it's 4 time to just go to the vote. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You're exactly right. 6 7 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I'd like to make a motion to deny the challenge to the 8 9 candidacy of Kimberly Brown. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Wait a second. 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It doesn't matter either 1 1 12 way. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Okay. That's all right. 13 I just (indiscernible) failing, that's fine. 1.4 15 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Failing to -- it looks like we're supposed to, obviously... 16 17 MR. S. GRAY: Could you repeat it because I didn't hear your motion, I'm sorry? 18 19 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I made a 20 motion to deny the challenge of the candidacy of 21 Kimberly Brown. 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Do I have a second for the motion -- I will second it -- the 23 24 Chair will second the motion for the purpose of

Any further discussion?

bring it to discussion.

(No response.) 1 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Any further public 2 discussion? 3 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: No, I have none. 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. All those in 5 favor of the motion, signify by saying aye? 6 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 7 Those opposed, CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Aye. 8 same sign? 9 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: No, or aye, whichever 10 11 way... MR. M. HAMMOND: Aye. 12 Either way. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 13 2-2 split. 14 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: That motion failed. 15 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That motion failed. 16 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I think just for the 17 record's sake, I'm going to make a motion we 18 sustain the challenge, and if that gets second, 19 then that gets you the same point that I think 2.0 we've exhausted both alternatives and then the 21 candidacy will survive as far as this board is 22 That's my only reason for doing that. 23 concerned.

24

25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And for the purposes of

bringing it to vote, I will second the motion of

the Vice Chair. Any further discussion? 1 2 (No response.) CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hearing none, all in 3 favor of sustaining the challenge, signify by 4 5 saying aye? 6 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 7 MR. M. HAMMOND: Aye. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same 8 sign? 9 10 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Aye. 2-2 split again. 12 That means that the challenge is defeated for those 13 purposes and maybe you can get somebody... 14 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Thank you all for coming 15 in. 16 MR. K. QUINN: I appreciate it. 17 MR. S. GRAY: I appreciate it. 18 MR. D. SIMMONS: We've got one more, Mr. Chairman. 19 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 21 have -- Brad, what is this one? 22 MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman is the very last 23 tab, 08-178. And again, this is an odd situation where your declaration of candidacy has been filed 24 25 with the Election Division. This is a situation to

this extent like Mr. Fields where a candidate has 1 filed a request to be on the ballot, and this 2 candidate actually only filed the CAN-2 3 declaration. 4 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What was -- what was the 6 problem here? What was the problem with your 7 filing? 8 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: If I may. I did send in the CAN-2 to the Election Division. I did send the FEI 9 10 to the judicial qualifications committee. just didn't get put together at the Election 11 12 Division. That was the problem. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Brad, tell me... MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, if I can refer the 14 15 Commission to that statute, 3-8-1-33. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 3-8-11 --MR. B. KING: 17 Nο. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 18 3 - 8 - 1. 19 MR. B. KING: 3-8-1-33 which says that a candidate for an office listed must file a 20 21 statement of economic interests, and then it lists 22 candidate for -- I believe this is superior court 23 judge --

MS. F. SCHWARTZ:

That's correct.

MR. B. KING: -- in Elkhart County.

24

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 3-8-1-33? 1 Yes, that's correct. 2 MR. B. KING: CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 3 That's on Page 160. And then I'll defer to Dale, there was another statute 4 which you just spoke out on, Dale. 5 3-8 -- 3-8-2-11 which is on 6 MR. D. SIMMONS: 7 Page 166. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And there's... MR. D. SIMMONS: There's a subsection C there 9 10 that cross reference as requirement to file that statement of economic interests and actually 11 requires us to receive a copy of the statement or a 12 13 receipt showing that it was filed, and if it's not, present it by the filing, the last sentence of that 14 15 section says the election division shall reject a 16 filing that does not comply. 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Shall reject? Shall reject. 18 MR. D. SIMMONS: 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And so in this case, the 20 Election Commission rejected the filing because the 21 economic interests statement was not attached? 22 MS. P. POTESTA: Mr. Chairman? 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm sorry, Pam. MS. P. POTESTA: 24 Ms. -- Mrs. Schwartz, is that 25 how you say it?

MS. F. SCHWARTZ: 1 Yes. MS. P. POTESTA: We received her CAN-2 without 2 her estimate of economic interests, and at that 3 time we attempted to contact her before the 4 deadline --5 6 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Correct. 7 MS. P. POTESTA: -- to let her know that she needed to get that to us before we could accept the 8 filing, and I'll let you finish. 9 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Okay. That is correct. 10 Ι 11 did write a letter, and do you each have my exhibits? 12 I hold the exhibits. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 14 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: A through F. 15 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I have a letter dated 16 February 29th. 17 Okay. And the exhibits. MS. F. SCHWARTZ: 18 While I did attempt to substantially comply with 19 the requirement, I will ask this commission to take 20 notice of Black's Law Dictionary, 8th Edition, 21 Brian A. Gardener, editor-in-chief wherein shall is 22 defined. Shall under the first definition says has a 23 2.4 duty to (indiscernible) is required to. However,

under Definition 5, shall is defined as is entitled

So that we define shall as entitled to, it is 1 to. not a requirement, but it is an option, and I would 2 3 ask this commission to consider that definition to more broadly construe the qualification 4 5 requirements. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You filed your economic 7 interests statement with the state court 8 administrator timely; is that correct? 9 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: That's correct. 10 received --11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Did you fail to attach 12 it to your CAN-2? 13 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Yes, sir. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So the issue is does the 15 word shall in our statute or says shall reject. 16 MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We -- we all 18 (indiscernible) of practicing lawyers understand 19 that the legislature has stopped using the word "shall" in a lot of places for exactly this reason. 20 21 However... 22 MR. D. SIMMONS: We -- we -- I mean I do and 23 have discussed this with Mr. King, it's sort of a 24 jurisdiction. It's not like a challenge. 25 something on the Election Commission, we were

1 required by statute. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And you read the shall I ask have to? 3 4 MR. D. SIMMONS: We -- we had to reject this as a filing. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And we did -- and you 6 7 did reject it so this is currently a rejected filing? 8 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: It is currently rejected. 9 10 MR. D. SIMMONS: When we rejected it, we did 11 not certify this as a CAN. So at this time I'm not 12 sure what jurisdictional book there would be for 13 the commission, unless it was like an earlier 14 candidate who had come up and said well I want you 15 to extend the deadline. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right, this is -- this 16 is -- this is similar to Mr... 17 18 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Although distinguishable, if 19 I may, because I did file the documents. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But their -- their 21 contention is that we don't have any jurisdiction over this. 22 I believe you do. 23 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, if I could add on 24 MR. B. KING:

what counsel said, in terms of our discussion, too,

this is a situation where in 2006 we had a couple of other candidate filings that were presented to us that the then co-directors refused to accept, not necessarily for a failure to attach economic interests statement, did not include it in various certifications, that candidate, they went to court to obtain (indiscernible) to compel the co-directors to issue certification, and I personally think that's the remedy for this candidate as opposed to the commission's...

1.4

2.4

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So the recommendation -I've heard the right side, and Pam, I kind of took
you as...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Closer to the right or the left?

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Left.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Literally to my right and now I'm going literally to my left -- it's not my fault you guys sit that way. From your side, you concur we had a jurisdictional -- there's a jurisdictional defect, we don't have jurisdiction over this?

MS. P. POTESTA: All I know is she attempted to file. She did not submit the proper paperwork. We also attempted to contact her and she received

the proper paperwork and we were unsuccessful in 1 getting ahold of her until after the deadline. 2 I'm not a lawyer but --3 Play one on TV. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 4 -- a lot of candidates missed 5 MS. P. POTESTA: the deadline and you've you voted on it so it's --6 it's not my decision. 7 8 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Leslie, do you have an 9 opinion? MS. F. SCHWARTZ: If I may make a comment? 10 believe you do have jurisdiction under 3-6-4.1-14. 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hold on a minute. 12 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: 3-6:4.1-14. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Page 55, powers and 14 duties? 15 MS. F. SCHWARTZ: It says that in 16 Yes. addition to other duties prescribed by law, the 17 18 commission shall do the following, that's under section 14(a) -- 2(a), govern the fair, legal and 19 orderly conduct of elections. I believe it falls 20 under there to look at the fair conduct of 21 elections. Fair I would equate with equitable and 22 23 so --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

thank you for doing that. My concern is you

My -- my concern --

25

construe our jurisdiction too broadly. I'm afraid if we were looking at the jurisdictional mandate over, quote, fair and legal and orderly conduct of elections, I believe that's premised by the immediately prior which says adopt rules to do the following -- I don't think it gives us discretion.

If we have -- we're allowed to adopt rules governing a fair and legal and orderly conduct of elections. I don't think we're allowed to exercise jurisdictional over individual issues such as this in order to ensure the fair and legal and orderly conduct of elections. I mean I read that as being modified by (indiscernible).

MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Okav

Your attention, I think if we tried that, the general assembly would slap us down fairly -- fairly vigorously. I mean what I heard from -- and I haven't heard anybody descending from this is that the appropriate place is a writ of mandamus seeking a mandate.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Can we get to advice of counsel down there, I -- if she has any additional?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: She's got her fingers on two spots at least.

MS. L. BARNES: Well, a writ of mandamus may be one option. I wonder what the commission has set today by allowing substantial compliance to be adequate. You're right, that 3-8-2-11 does say that if a candidate does not file a copy of her statement of economic interests or receipt, the division shall reject the filing that does not comply with this subsection. So now we're back to the division to determine whether there's been substantial compliance.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean I -- I did make the vote as approving my substantial compliance argument, but I think that was my personal opinion on substantial compliance. I believe the Commission...

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: And in that particular case, we have a split decision so there has been no ruling from the commission on substantial compliance.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Certainly...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It says that the division shall, and I'm not -- you know, this is a troublesome area, too, but the division shall reject the filing, and I guess the argument may be if the division, if it rejects the filings that it

never gets to -- before us, that there would have 1 2 to be amended -- a mandamus to require the division to accept the filing. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I think that's where 4 5 we were, which is your -- I think the division has discretion to accept or reject that filing. 6 7 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I don't think they have discretion. I think if it's not there, they can't 8 I mean I read -- I'm old -- I'm old 9 accept it. 10 school. Shall means shall. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Shall means shall. 11 12 hear you. 13 MS. L. BARNES: Well, no. And I would agree that the word shall means shall, but under 3-8-1 --14 15 MR. D. SIMMONS: 2, but this is not -- this is not a challenge again. 1.6 It's not a challenge. 17 MS. L. BARNES: 18 MR. D. SIMMONS: It's not a challenge. 19 MS. L. BARNES: But the language says the 20 commission shall deny a filing if it doesn't comply 21 and this says the division shall reject a filing if 22 it doesn't comply. I'm just going by... Mr. Chairman, I think we can 23 MR. D. SIMMONS: take that up as counsel with our individual 24

co-directors and advise them accordingly. I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

they --

I think the point -- the CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: point is this: Do we as the Commission have jurisdiction to do anything about the Division -the Division's made the decision to reject this filing, regardless of what the stand is, do we as the commission have the ability in this forum and this context to review that decision? That's the question I'm asking.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And I don't think I'll have to error that I don't think we do, but I think to protect Schwartz's position here, we shouldn't just turn it down, we should turn it down because of lack of jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right. That gives her the ability to go...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Then -- then she's exhausted that remedy and apply for the -- apply to the court for a writ.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is that a motion? VICE CHAIR A. LONG:

Yeah.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Second.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's been made and seconded that we deny it for lack of jurisdiction which will allow her to pursue a

10 11

13 14

12

15

16

18

17

19

20

21

22 23

24

```
different remedy as the co-directors have chosen.
1
                                   If she chooses to.
             VICE CHAIR A. LONG:
2
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If she chooses.
3
             VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It would be nice to
4
        (indiscernible).
5
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:
                                    That, it would.
6
7
             COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: We're going to
8
        find out.
                                    All right, the motion's
 9
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:
        been made and seconded, any further discussion?
10
              (No response.)
11
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All in favor, signify by
12
        saying aye?
13
             THE COMMISSION:
                               Aye.
14
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same
15
        sign?
16
              (No response.)
17
             CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:
                                    I'll accept a motion to
18
        adjourn.
19
             COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Motion to
20
21
        adjourn.
             VICE CHAIR A. LONG:
                                   We've got a --
22
             MS. F. SCHWARTZ: Thank you so much.
23
              VICE CHAIR A. LONG:
                                   I got on the agenda --
2.4
              CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:
                                    Oh, cool.
25
```

-- to set meetings. 1 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yes. 2 I don't want to do that VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 3 necessarily today. 4 No, I agree 100 percent. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I would suggest that we VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 6 7 direct staff to outline went we have to have meetings and get with our respective calendars and 8 9 let's get our meetings, mandatory meetings set for the rest of the year, and then that way we won't 10 have these nightmares trying to... 11 Absolutely. 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I --I -- I agree with that a hundred percent. 13 said to you when you asked about it, Sarah and I, 14 it's easy for us. 15 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: I know. 16 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: We used to do this. 17 used to set them, then we can always take -- if we 18 19 set them, then we can always take them off because we don't need them. 20 And the only reason, my 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: general policy is not to have meetings if we don't 22 need meetings. 23 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Yep. 24

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

There's no reason to

25

VICE CHAIR A. LONG:

drag you guys down here.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Then if we set some meetings, then I can refer to them to my calendar, then I get an extra workday.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Well, mean I (indiscernible).

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Well, it's all right if we don't have the meeting. I can get some work done in the office. I would move that counsel, that the co-directors proceed to set up meetings scheduled for the balance of the year with our respective calendars.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Keeping in mind -keeping in mind the deadlines, the form deadlines.

If the clerks need anything -- if we're going to do
those, maybe do a -- schedule a short one for the
clerks (indiscernible). All right. I've got a
motion to adjourn.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Motion to do that and adjourn.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Second

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Seconded, all in favor, signify by saying aye?

THE COMMISSION: Aye.

1	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Thank you all.
2	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Thanks guys.
3	(At this time the proceedings were concluded.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	